



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/509,771

03/21/2005

Paul Rowland Beardow

6257-32202

2156

35690

7590

03/12/2010

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

CRAWLEY, TALIA F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3687

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent\_docketing@intprop.com

ptomhkg@gmail.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/509,771	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BEARDOW, PAUL ROWLAND	
	<b>Examiner</b> TALIA CRAWLEY	<b>Art Unit</b> 3687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 82-93,98-114,118-120,122 and 130-139 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 130-132 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 82-93,98-114,119,120,122 and 133-139 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20091020</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Prosecution History Summary***

- Claims 82-93, 98-114, 118-120, 122, and 130-139 are pending in the instant application.
- Claims 130-132 have been cancelled per Applicant's submission dated 10/20/2009.
- Claim 139 has been newly added per Applicant's submission dated 10/20/2009.
- Claims 82, 83, 86, 90-93, 98, 100, 101,105,108-112,118, 133, 134, and 136-138 have been amended.

### ***Response to Amendment***

The objection to claim 101 has been withdrawn per Applicant's submission dated 10/20/2009.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3687

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 82-92 and 98-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burke (US Patent No 6,304,855) in view of Kerret (International Publication No WO01/69364) and further in view of Kanefsky (US 6,603,984).**

**As per claim 82**, Burke discloses a method comprising a wireless telephony device operating in a first display mode that permits displaying images in a display area that includes a foreground display portion and a background display portion wherein the operating includes:

displaying a first image in the background display portion;

in the foreground display portion (see for example Figures 8 and 9), but does not explicitly disclose wherein in response to receiving an incoming phone call or initiating an outgoing phone call, the wireless telephony device switching from the first operating mode to a second operating mode, wherein the second operating

Art Unit: 3687

mode does not include displaying the display area.

However, Kanefsky does disclose a similar method, which method of Kanefsky indeed includes wherein in response to receiving an incoming phone call or initiating an outgoing phone call, the wireless telephony device switching from the first operating mode to a second operating mode, wherein the second operating mode includes discontinuing the displaying of the first image and the second image (see for example column 4, lines 63-65, wherein generally a consumer viewing the wireless device can observe a single folder at a time and navigate about the menu by scrolling about the various items contained in each folder).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included wherein in response to receiving an incoming phone call or initiating an outgoing phone call, the wireless telephony device switching from the first operating mode to a second operating mode, wherein the second operating mode does not include displaying the display area, in accordance with the teaching of Kanefsky, in order to enable the user to store a selected image for review after the completion of a state change event, such as placing or receiving a phone call, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Art Unit: 3687

**As per claim 83**, Burke discloses a method according to claim 82, wherein the first image is received as a constructable set of parts (see for example column 2, lines 56-59).

**As per claim 84**, Burke discloses a method according to claim 82, wherein displaying said second image comprises displaying the first image from a selectable direction (see for example column 11, lines 11-14).

**As per claim 85**, Burke discloses a method according to claim 82, wherein displaying said second image comprises displaying the first image from a selectable distance (see for example column 9, lines 20--22).

**As per claim 86**, Burke discloses a method according to claim 82, wherein said first image is representative of an object being advertised, and wherein said second image is representative of the same object (see for example column 5, lines 27-39).

**As per claim 87**, Burke discloses a method according to claim 82, but does not explicitly disclose wherein said first image is the same as the second image (see for example column 9, lines 20-22).

However, the reference Kerret et al does explicitly disclose wherein said first image is the same as the second image (see for example page 14, lines 11-14, wherein the user may be presented with a thumbnail view of a close-up

Art Unit: 3687

image of the item, and if the user clicks on the thumbnail, the close up images may be displayed at a sufficient size to allow the user to make an informed decision regarding the item).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included wherein said first image is the same as the second image, in accordance with the teaching of Kerret et al, in order to enable the user to select said image for enlargement to accommodate closer inspection, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 88**, Burke discloses a method according to claim 82, wherein first image comprises a representation of a first photograph (see for example column 4, lines 36-38).

**As per claim 89**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, wherein second image comprises a representation of a second photograph (see for example column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-4).

**As per claim 90**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, but does not explicitly disclose wherein wireless telephony device is configured to move an image across the background display portion until the image is selected for

Art Unit: 3687

display in the foreground display portion (see for example column 7, line 67 and column 8, lines 1-3).

However, the reference Kerret et al does explicitly disclose wherein the wireless telephony device is configured to move images across the background display portion until selected for display in the foreground display portion (see for example pages 13-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included wherein wireless telephony device is configured to move images across the background display portion until selected for display in the foreground display portion, in accordance with the teaching of Kerret et al, in order to enable the user to select said image for enlargement to accommodate closer inspection, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 91**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, the size of the second image is greater than the size of the first image, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the second image overlaps and obscures one or more images in the background display portion. The prior art reference Burke does not explicitly disclose wherein the second image obscures any image it overlaps that is in the background display portion.



However, causing said second image to obscure any image which it overlaps and which is still in the background is well known to those of ordinary skill in the art, and official notice to that effect is hereby taken

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included causing said second image to obscure any image which it overlaps and which is still in the background in order to enable the user to view an enlarged version of a selected image, since doing so could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 92**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, wherein the operating in the first display mode further includes in response to the selection of the first image, displaying a third image in the background display portion and removing the first image from the background display portion (see for example Figures 8 and 9). Burke does not explicitly disclose wherein the computing device is a wireless telephony device.

However, the reference Kerret et al does explicitly disclose wherein the computing device is a wireless telephony device (see for example page 6, lines 27-32, wherein the client may be a personal computer...a handheld computing device...or any other suitable computing device that has a monitor or other display and that communicates with a network).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included wherein the computing device is a wireless telephony device, in accordance with the teaching of Kerret et al, in order to enable the user to view and purchase items in a mobile setting, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 93**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, but does not explicitly disclose the method according to claim 32, wherein the second mode further includes storing state information that is representative of at least one of the group consisting of the first image, the second image, the state of the foreground display portion, and the state of the background display portion; and

Wherein subsequent to switching to the second mode, the wireless telephony device using the stored state information to display at least one of the group consisting of the first image and the second image.

However, Kanefsky does disclose a similar method, which method of Kanefsky indeed includes the method according to claim 32, further comprising wherein the second mode further includes storing state information that is representative of at least one of the group consisting of the first image, the second image, the state of the foreground display portion, and the state of the background display portion (see for example column 5, lines 21-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Kerret et al so as to have included the method according to claim 32, further comprising wherein the second mode further includes storing state information that is representative of at least one of the group consisting of the first image, the second image, the state of the foreground display portion, and the state of the background display portion, in accordance with the teaching of Kanefsky, in order to enable the user to store a selected image for later review, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Both the Burke and the Kanefsky reference are silent regarding wherein subsequent to switching to the second mode, the wireless telephony device using the stored state information to display at least one of the group consisting of the first image and the second image.

However, the prior art reference Kanefsky does indeed disclose wherein the server monitors the actions of a user and stores all said actions in memory (see for example column 5, lines 20-28). One of ordinary skill would recognize that although not explicitly disclosed by the prior art, the system of the prior art is enable to recall stored information from memory, and it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of the prior art to include the aforementioned limitation of claim 93, since doing so could be performed

Art Unit: 3687

readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 98**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, further comprising:

detecting a classification of a good or service represented by the first image; and receiving additional images for display, wherein the additional images are selected using the classification (see for example column 9, lines 53-63).

**As per claim 99**, Burke discloses a method, according to claim 82, wherein the first image is representative of a first object of a plurality of objects, but does not disclose wherein the wireless telephony device receives the first image as part of a set of images that comprises additional images representative of other objects of the plurality of objects.

However, Kerret discloses a similar method, which method of Kerret indeed includes the sending step comprising transmitting a set of images relating to the plurality of objects to the mobile receiver device upon receiving a request from the receiver device (see for example pages 6 -7 and 13-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included the sending step comprising transmitting a set of images relating to the

Art Unit: 3687

plurality of objects to the mobile receiver device upon receiving a request from the receiver device, in accordance with the teaching of Kerret, in order to enable the user to manipulate an image on the mobile device away from a stationary computing device, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**4. Claims 100-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerret (International Publication No WO01/69364) in view of Burke (US 6,304,855), further in view of Kanefsky (US 6,603,984).**

**As per claim 100**, the reference Kerret et al discloses a system, comprising:

a wireless receiver device, configured to receive a first image from a first sender;

A display;

A processor; and

Memory coupled to the processor (see for example page 6, lines 25-33), the memory having stored thereon instructions executable by the system to cause the system to:

display the first image of the object in a background portion of the display

In response to a selection of the first image, display a second image in a foreground portion of the display (see for example pages 13-14 and Figures 7a-7d).

Art Unit: 3687

The reference Kerret et al does not explicitly disclose, wherein in response to receiving an incoming communication from a remote second sender that is different than the first sender; discontinue the displaying of the first image and the second image, however, discontinuing a display associated with one mode (viewing advertisements) in order to conduct a transaction in a separate mode (receiving an incoming call) is well known to those of ordinary skill in the art, and official notice to that effect is hereby taken (see for example US Application 2003/0096625).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the system of Kerret et al so as to have included receiving an incoming communication from a remote second sender that is different than the first sender; discontinue the displaying of the first image and the second image, in order to enable the user to still receive incoming phone calls while viewing images, since doing so could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

None of the cited reference explicitly disclose wherein the system stores state information usable to re-display at least one of the group consisting of the first image and the second image; and subsequent to discontinuing the displaying of the first image and the second image, using the stored state information to display at least one of the group consisting of the first image and the second image.

Art Unit: 3687

However, the prior art reference Kanefsky does indeed disclose wherein the server monitors the actions of a user and stores all said actions in memory (see for example column 5, lines 20-28). One of ordinary skill would recognize that although not explicitly disclosed by the prior art, the system of the prior art is enable to recall stored information from memory, and it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of the prior art to include the aforementioned limitation of claim 100, since doing so could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the system of Kerret et al so as to have included wherein in response to a state change event that causes the system to change from the first operating mode to a second operating mode in which the background portion and foreground portion are not displayed by the system, storing state information usable to re-display at least a portion of the information in the background portion and foreground portion; and switching from the first operating mode to the second operating mode, in accordance with the teaching of Kanefsky, in order to enable the user to store a selected image for review after the completion of a state change event, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 101**, Burke discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein the system is configured to receive the first image as a constructable set of parts (see for example column 6, lines 28-45).

**As per claim 102**, Burke discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein displaying said second image comprises displaying the first image from a selectable direction (see for example column 11, lines 11-14).

**As per claim 103**, Burke discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein displaying said second image comprises displaying the first image from a selectable distance (see for example column 9, lines 26-35).

**As per claim 104**, Kerret discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein the wireless receiver, processor, and memory are within a wireless telephony device (see for example page 6, lines 27-33). The reference does not explicitly disclose wherein the aforementioned parts are within the wireless telephony device, but the elements mentioned above are inherently encompassed within a wireless telephony device, as understood by one of ordinary skill.

**As per claim 105**, Kerret discloses a system according to claim 104, but does



Art Unit: 3687

not explicitly disclose wherein the incoming communication is an incoming phone call.

However, Kanefsky does disclose a similar system, which system of Kanefsky indeed includes wherein the state changes event comprises at least one of the system receiving an incoming phone call, and the system initiating an outgoing phone call (see for example column 3, lines 5-10, wherein an activated script can assist in acquiring and coordinating any other desired service by evoking commands directed to various activities, such as...placing a phone call to a particular service provider).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the system of Kerret et al so as to have included wherein the state changes event comprises at least one of the system receiving an incoming phone call, and the system initiating an outgoing phone call, in accordance with the teaching of Kanefsky, in order to enable the user complete various activities in addition to viewing and purchasing items, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 106**, Burke discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein said first image is a representation of a first photograph (see for example column 3, lines 57-67).

**As per claim 107**, Burke discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein said a second image is a representation of a second photograph (see for example column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-4).

**As per claim 108**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 100, wherein said system is configured to move a plurality of images across the background portion until one of the plurality of images is selected for foreground display in the foreground portion (see for example column 3, lines 63-65 and Figures 7, 8, and 9).

**As per claim 109**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 100, wherein the size of the second image is greater than the size of the first image, wherein the second image overlaps any one or more images in the background portion(see for example column 9, lines 19-35, and figure 9).

**As per claim 110**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 100, wherein the instructions are executable by the processor system to further cause the system to, responsive to a selection of the first image, display a third image in the background portion and remove the first image from the background portion (see for example Figures 8 and 9).

**As per claim 111**, Kanefsky discloses a system, according to claim 100, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the stored state information is usable to redisplay the first image and the second image. However, the prior art reference Kanefsky does indeed disclose wherein the server monitors the actions of a user and stores all said actions in memory (see for example column 5, lines 20-28). One of ordinary skill would recognize that although not explicitly disclosed by the prior art, the system of the prior art is enable to recall stored information from memory, and it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of the prior art to include the aforementioned limitation of claim 111, since doing so could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 112**, Burke discloses a system according to claim 100, wherein said first image is representative of an object, and wherein said second image is representative of the same object (see for example column 9, lines 19-35).

**As per claim 113**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 105, wherein said first image is the same as the second image (see for example column 9, lines 19-35).

**As per claim 114**, Kerret et al discloses a system, according to claims 100, wherein the first image is an advertisement of a good or service (see for example page 17, 5-13).

**As per claim 118**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 100, wherein the instructions are executable by the system to further cause the system to:

- a classification of a good or service represented by the first image; and

receive images for display, wherein the received images are selected using the classification (see for example column 8, lines 11-21).

**As per claim 119**, Kerret discloses a system, according to claim 100, wherein the first image is representative of a first object of a plurality of objects, wherein the system receives the first image as part of a set of images that comprises additional images representative of other objects of the plurality of objects (see for example pages 14, lines 7-15).

**As per claim 120**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 104, but does not explicitly disclose wherein said wireless telephony device comprises a mobile telephone handset or a personal digital assistant.

Art Unit: 3687

However, Kerret discloses a similar system, which system of Kerret indeed includes wherein said wireless telephony device comprises a mobile telephone handset or a Personal Digital Assistant (see for example page 6, lines 27-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of Burke so as to have included wherein said receiver device comprises a mobile telephone handset or a Personal Digital Assistant, in accordance with the teaching of Kerret, in order to enable the user to view and purchase images remote from a stationary computing device, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**As per claim 122**, Burke discloses a system, according to claim 100, wherein said first image is received using the World Wide Web (see for example page 1, lines 23-25).

**5. Claims 133-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanefsky (US 6,603,984) in view of Burke (US 6,304,855).**

As per **claim 133**, Kanefsky discloses a system, comprising:

Art Unit: 3687

first means for receiving a first image from a first sender;

second means for providing a display of one or more images;

third means for causing the system to:

display the first image in a background portion of the display;

in response to a selection of the first image, display a second image in a

foreground portion of the display; and

in response to the system receiving incoming communication from a second

sender that is not the first sender: store state information representative of

a current state of the display (see for example column 5, lines 21-28);

discontinue displaying of the first image and the second image (see for example

column 4, lines 63-68). The prior art does not explicitly disclose wherein

subsequent to discontinuing the displaying of the first image and the second

image, using the stored state information to display at least one of the group

consisting of the first image and the second image.

However, the prior art reference Kanefsky does indeed disclose wherein the

server monitors the actions of a user and stores all said actions in memory (see

for example column 5, lines 20-28). One of ordinary skill would recognize that

although not explicitly disclosed by the prior art, the system of the prior art is

enable to recall stored information from memory, and it would have been obvious

for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of the prior art to include

the aforementioned limitation of claim 136, since doing so could be performed

readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue

experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

As per **claim 134**, the language of claim 134 is similar to that of claim 133, and therefore claim 134 is rejected for the same reasoning that was applied to claim 133.

As per **claim 135**, Burke discloses a computer-readable medium according to claim 134, wherein the method further comprises:  
in response to the selection of the first image, displaying a third image in the background portion of the display, wherein the third image is representative a second object that is different than the first object; and  
removing the display of the first image from the background portion of the display (see for example Figures 8 and 9).

As per **claim 136**, Kanefsky discloses a computer-readable medium according to claim 134, wherein the first image is an advertisement of a good or service, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the method further comprises using the stored state information to display at least one of the group consisting of the first image and the second image. However, the prior art reference Kanefsky does indeed disclose wherein the server monitors the actions of a user and stores all said actions in memory (see for example column 5, lines 20-28). One of ordinary skill would recognize that although not explicitly disclosed by the prior art, the system of the prior art is enable to recall stored information from memory, and it

Art Unit: 3687

would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of the prior art to include the aforementioned limitation of claim 136, since doing so could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

As per **claim 137**, the language of claim 137 is similar to that of claim 134, and therefore claim 137 is rejected for the same reasoning as was applied to claim 134.

As per **claim 138**, the language of claim 138 is similar to that of claim 136, and therefore claim 138 is rejected for the same reasoning that was applied to claim 136.

**6. Claim 139 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanefsky (US 6,603,984) in view of Burke (US 6,304,855) and further in view of Kerret (International Publication No WO01/69364).**

As per **claim 139**, Kerret discloses a method according to claim 137, wherein the first image and the second image are advertising images (see for example page 17, 5-13).

***Response to Arguments***



Art Unit: 3687

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 83-139 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3687

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Talia F. Crawley whose telephone number is 571-270-5397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on 571-272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3687  
02/25/2010

/Matthew S Gart/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 3687